UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,422	01/11/2006	Saul R. Dooley	GB 030113	8967

65913   7590   07/01/2009

NXP, B.V.
NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & LICENSING
M/S41-SJ
1109 MCKAY DRIVE
SAN JOSE, CA 95131

EXAMINER
DSOUZA, JOSEPH FRANCIS A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2611	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/01/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

Response to Arguments

1.   Examiner as accepted Applicant's new drawing (6/10/2009) and the

corresponding change in the specification.

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 6/10/2009 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Argument: Applicant argued that (a) Medlock does not disclose carrying out word-

based, hard-wired operations to process first and second words in order to obtain a

correlation value (Remarks 6/10/2009, page 9, last paragraph, 2nd line onwards) (b) that

Medlock disclosed that the correlation process is implemented one chip at a time

(Remarks 6/10/2009, page 9, last paragraph, 5th line onwards) and that (c) processing

two separate signals in parallel on a bit-by-bit basis is not the same as word-based

processing because the separate chips or bits from separate signals do not constitute a

word, even if they are processed in parallel.

Response: Examiner respectfully disagrees. Medlock states that in Fig. 3, multiply block

304 contains multiple multiply logic devices in the present embodiment for multiplying

chips of a first code sequence with chips of a second code sequence then summing

them with an adder [0043], lines 8 – 11). Medlock then clearly states that in one

embodiment, the multiply circuit has bit slices that contain a multiply-logic device for

parallel correlating operations on a chip-by-chip basis. This clearly differentiates from

the previous embodiment since Medlock states that that parallel correlating is used. In

parallel correlating it is well known that the multiply operations are performed in parallel

and opposed to sequentially, since this speed ups the correlation process at the

expense of more hardware. The chips are parallel are interpreted as one bit values

combined to form a word. This interpretation is consistent with what he Applicant has

described in his specification as to how a word is formed (see Specification, page 2,

lines 23- 28). Therefore, Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's statement that

that Medlock does not disclose word based processing and also does not disclose that

the multiplication process is performed in parallel.

/Adolf DSouza/

Examiner, Art Unit 2611

/Mohammad H Ghayour/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2611